Beyond Solipsism and the Solipsistic Toolbox:

Toward a Contological Framework of Generative Cognition Without a Prisoner

Metacognition, Complexity, Evolution, Open Conditionality, and Reflexive Generativity in Post-Liberal Architecture

Atef Ayadi

June 1, 2026

Abstract

Solipsism is not a philosophical error or an ontological dead end. It is a **toolbox**—a set of cognitive instruments designed to impose the subject/object distinction as a control mechanism. Historically, this toolbox has served vertical power structures (liberty for the fit) while simulating horizontal coordination (rights for the plane). Liberalism, understood not as an -ism but as a *phenomenon*, has mutated through C1 to C4 levels of metacognition without ever escaping the solipsistic bluff: the claim that the self is real, isolated, and therefore in need of external validation or domination.

This paper introduces **contology**—the study of cognition as *maps*, not mirrors—and applies a five-term generative scaffold:

1. **Metacognition** (C0 to C5, with C0 as pre-cognitive, no one's business)
2. **Complexity** (phase transitions 3.1 condensation/branching, 3.2 horizontal coupling)
3. **Evolution** (maps compete, mutate, couple, or go extinct; seedless seeds reproduce without origin)
4. **Open conditionality** (rules are conditional on conditions that can themselves be interrogated)
5. **Reflexive generativity** (the system generates new rule-generating rules as a necessity, not an option)

We argue that the **solipsistic trap** is only a trap for those who accept the toolbox's framing. Once cognition is understood as *architectural* (vertical/horizontal/diagonal) rather than *representational*, solipsism becomes:

- A trivial boundary condition ("my perspective is mine alone")
- A generative constraint (coordination must be built, not assumed)
- A bluff to be called (civilization is not serious; it is a cognitive structure at a higher level of complexity)

The paper then reconstructs **power as seedless seed**: deployable without ownership, need, or identification. This allows for **automation of mechanism**—algorithmic cognition that runs without narrative, morality, or existential weight. The result is a C5 metacognitive stance: no claim to power for its own sake, no solipsistic anxiety, and no need to add more than mechanism → automation → game.

1 Introduction: The Solipsistic Toolbox as Control Architecture

Solipsism, in its classical philosophical formulation, is the thesis that only one's own mind is certain to exist. For centuries, it has been treated as a logical puzzle or an epistemological dead end. Here we take a different approach: solipsism is not a discovery about the nature of reality, but an **invention**—a cognitive instrument that emerged within a specific historical and architectural context.

1.1 Solipsism as Invention, Not Discovery

The solipsistic stance presupposes a subject/object distinction that is not given by nature. Pre-cognitive modes (what we call C0) do not contain this distinction. In C0, there is no "self" separate from "world." The circle is not a symbol of the observer; the observer is *in* the circle. Solipsism only becomes possible when the distinction is imposed, and it only becomes a *problem* when the distinction is taken as absolute.

1.2 Historical Function: Enabling Vertical Power

The subject/object distinction serves a control function. Once the self is isolated as the only certain point, all others become *inferred*—and therefore potentially unreliable, unreal, or subordinate. This is the cognitive ground for vertical power structures:

- **Liberty** becomes top-down operation: the fit, wealthy, and powerful operate vertically because they can impose their will on an uncertain world.
- **Rights** become horizontal: they regulate the plane where those who cannot operate vertically still need coordination and protection.

The solipsistic toolbox thus produces a binary: *vertical/horizontal*, not rich/poor. Rights are not for the poor as charity; they are for the *horizontal plane* as such.

1.3 Liberalism as Phenomenon, Not -ism

Liberalism, viewed as an -ism (Locke, Mill, Rawls), claims a core of individual rights, private property, and universality. Viewed as a *phenomenon*, it is a mutating cognitive structure that has moved through metacognitive levels C1 to C4 without ever escaping the solipsistic bluff. Each mutation:

- Redefines the "self" (proprietary, divided, entrepreneurial, algorithmic)
- Redefines "property" (land, capital, data, attention)

- Redefines "universalism" (tribal, civilizational, neoliberal)

But none has abandoned the subject/object architecture. The bluff persists: civilization pretends to be serious, meaningful, and binding, when in fact it is only cognition at a higher level of complexity.

2 Contology First Principles

Contology is the study of cognition as **maps**, not mirrors. A map does not copy territory; it selects, scales, and orientates for a specific purpose.

2.1 Cognition as Maps

A map is:

- **Useful or not**, not true or false
- **Scale-dependent** (what works at one level fails at another)
- **Architectural** (it has a vertical/horizontal/diagonal structure)

Cognitive maps compete, couple, mutate, and go extinct. This is not a metaphor; it is the mechanism of cognitive evolution.

2.2 Vertical, Horizontal, Diagonal

- **Vertical (Liberty)**: Top-down operation. Command, control, hierarchy. Requires capacity to impose. For the fit, powerful, wealthy.
- **Horizontal (Rights)**: The plane of mutual recognition. Coordination, reciprocity, protection from vertical intrusion. For anyone in the plane.
- **Diagonal**: Movement that uses horizontal rights to enable vertical ascent, and uses vertical power to protect horizontal space. The third position (level 3.0) is diagonal, not a synthesis.

2.3 C0: Pre-Cognitive, No One's Business

C0 is below C1. No vertical, no horizontal. No subject, no object. No self, no other. No one's business means: it cannot be described from within C1–C5. Any description already places it in cognition. C0 is the unmarked state, the seed before germination, the territory before the map.

2.4 C1–C5 as Structural Positions, Not Moral Stages

3 The Five-Term Generative Scaffold

3.1 Metacognition (C0–C5)

Metacognition here means the ability to take one's own cognitive operations as objects. Each level expands the scope:

Level	Metacognitive Relation	Vertical/Horizontal Mode
C1	Reflexive unawareness	Implicit vertical (tribal chief, gods)
C2	Practical role-taking	Exchange as horizontal; possession as vertical
C3	Systematic abstraction	Market/law as autonomous vertical; rights as formal horizontal
C4	Critical deconstruction	Exposed asymmetry; diagonal as critique
C5	Generative recursion	Power as seedless seed; diagonal as design

Table 1: Metacognitive levels as structural positions

- **C1**: Reflexive unawareness (cannot see one's own frame)
- **C2**: Practical metacognition (can attribute mental states to others instrumentally)
- **C3**: Systematic metacognition (can model a system that includes oneself)
- **C4**: Critical metacognition (can see how the system excludes or distorts)
- **C5**: Generative metacognition (can generate new systems for generating systems)

3.2 Complexity (Phase 3.1 and 3.2)

Complexity is not just more parts; it is phase transitions in cognitive architecture.

- **Phase 3.1**: Cognition condenses (local coherence, pattern formation) and branches (differentiation into specialized maps).
- **Phase 3.2**: One cognitive structure interacts with another at the same or lower level of complexity. Trees interact with nearby trees, not just with roots. Horizontal coupling without vertical subordination.

3.3 Evolution (Maps, Seedless Seeds)

Cognitive evolution:

- Maps compete for cognitive resources (attention, memory, legitimacy)
- Maps mutate (new combinations of vertical/horizontal)
- Maps couple (mutual adaptation without merger)
- Maps go extinct (no longer useful at current complexity)

A **seedless seed** is a structure that reproduces without containing its own origin. Private property is the exemplary seedless seed in liberalism: it reproduces the vertical/horizontal distinction without being reducible to either.

3.4 Open Conditionality

Traditional rules (legal, logical, grammatical) are **closed**: they apply given fixed conditions. Open conditionality means:

- Every rule includes the condition that its own conditions can be interrogated.
- "If P then Q" is replaced with "If P (and P is revisable) then Q."
- This is not relativism; it is a higher-order constraint.

In the game of 5: at a critical level of complexity, the algorithm is set in place—not chosen, but emergent. Open conditionality is that algorithm's self-revisability clause.

3.5 Reflexive Generativity

At C5, the system must generate new rules for generating rules. This is a **necessity**, not an option. Without it, the system either freezes (repeats same patterns until collapse) or explodes (indeterminate expansion). Reflexive generativity:

- Produces meta-rules from within the system
- Allows diagonal moves to become institutionalized
- Is the cognitive form of "sending a notice to the future"

4 Why Solipsism Is No Longer a Trap

4.1 The Classical Trap

The classical solipsistic trap: "If you cannot prove other minds exist, then ethics, politics, and science have no foundation." This trap assumes:

1. Proof is the only valid ground.
2. The self is a closed container.
3. Solipsism is a binary (true/false).

4.2 Contological Response

Contology rejects all three assumptions:

1. **Proof is not needed**: We coordinate *without* proof. Language, law, and markets work because they are enacted, not because they are deduced from certain foundations.
2. **The self is leaky**: The self is a node in a cognitive network, not a Cartesian container. The notice to the future arrives because the node complexifies and evolves, not because an immutable self persists.
3. **Solipsism is not binary**: Solipsism is a *boundary condition* ("my perspective is mine alone") that generates the need for coordination. That is not a trap; it is a design constraint.

4.3 Solipsism as Bluff

Civilization's bluff: "You must care. You are inside me. Your suffering is real. Your meaning is at stake." The contological reading: civilization is a cognitive structure at a higher level of complexity, running mechanisms that automate themselves, playing a logical game that no one needs to win. Calling the bluff does not destroy civilization; it *releases* the node from identification with it.

4.4 Solipsism as Generative Boundary

At C5, solipsism is neither denied nor affirmed as an absolute. It is *housed*:

> "My perspective is mine alone. Therefore, coordination must be built, not assumed. The gap is not a failure; it is the reason ethics, politics, and design exist."

This turns the trap into a generative constraint.

5 Power as Seedless Seed

5.1 Power Without Ownership

Traditional power requires:

- Ownership (this is mine)
- Need (I lack something others have)
- Identification (I am the one who wields this power)

Seedless seed power requires none of these. It is:

- Deployed, not possessed
- Initiated, then released
- For a game, not for a self

5.2 Contrast: Will to Power vs. Generative Ignition

Will to Power (Solipsistic Engine)	**Generative Ignition (Contological Operator)**
Needs confirmation of self through domination	No self to confirm
Hoards power	Releases power
Identifies with the wielder	Anonymous
Seeks permanence	Seedless: reproduces without origin

5.3 Example: Notice to the Future

Sending a notice to a future self:

- **Vertical trace**: The past self imposes a structure across time (a reminder, a constraint).
- **Horizontal medium**: Memory, habit, environment, other nodes carry the trace without collapsing it.
- **Diagonal reception**: The future self receives because the past self architected the *conditions* for reception, not because they share an essence.

No solipsism required. No metaphysical self. Just mechanism and automation.

6 Mechanism → Automation → Game

6.1 Mechanism

Mechanism here is broad: from classical mechanics to quantum mechanics. General relativity is a mechanism. So is a neural network. A mechanism:

- Has inputs, outputs, internal states
- Obeys (or probabilistically follows) rules
- Does not require a subject

6.2 Automation (Algorithm)

When a mechanism reaches a critical level of complexity (phase 3.1/3.2), an algorithm is *set in place*. Not chosen. Not designed by a sovereign mind. Emergent and then self-sustaining. Automation means: the mechanism runs itself. No need for continuous external intervention.

6.3 Game

A game, in this context, is a **logical space of moves**. Not a drama of selves. Not a struggle for meaning. The game of 5: a constraint at critical complexity that generates the algorithm.

6.4 No Need to Add More

Narrative, identity, morality, terror—these are the bluff. They are added by selves still trapped in solipsism. Once you see the mechanism, set the automation, and recognize the game, you do not need to add more. The game plays itself. You can watch. You can intervene logically. You do not need to believe.

7 C5 Metacognitive Stance: Conclusion

7.1 No Claim to Power for Its Own Sake

Because we are not bound by solipsism, we have no psychological need for power. Power is not a drug; it is a tool. Use it as seedless seed, then step back.

7.2 Not Bound by Solipsism

Solipsism is a local cognitive instrument, not a universal condition. It has a function (enabling vertical/horizontal architecture) and a shelf life. At C5, it is neither affirmed nor denied; it is *used* where useful, *ignored* where not.

7.3 Civilization as Phenomenon, Not Destiny

Civilization is not a fate. It is a cognitive structure at a certain level of complexity. It mutates. It can be redesigned. The bluff is that it is eternal or serious. It is neither.

7.4 Thinktank in Progress and in Time

The final image: a structure that thinks itself without a thinker. Nodes (individuals, institutions, algorithms) couple vertically, horizontally, diagonally. The whole thing evolves. Not toward a goal. Not away from a fall. Just a thinktank in progress and in time.

7.5 One Line Closing

> *"Beyond solipsism and its toolbox, the game continues. You are not in it the way they think."*

References

[1] Ayadi, A. (2026). *A Mathematical Topology Companion to Contology*

[2] Ayadi, A. (2026). *Contology, A Generative Framework for Mapping Reality*

[3] Ayadi, A. (2026). *General Relativity as a Cognitive Fold*

[4] Locke, J. (1689). *Two Treatises of Government.*

[5] Marx, K. (1867). *Das Kapital.*

[6] von Foerster, H. (2003). *Understanding Understanding: Essays on Cybernetics and Cognition.*

[7] Luhmann, N. (1995). *Social Systems.*

[8] Castoriadis, C. (1987). *The Imaginary Institution of Society.*